

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 12, 2003. New Claims 22-39 have been added and are presented for examination, of which Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 are in independent form. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-17, and 19-21 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) and a corresponding PTO-1449 form were submitted on November 24, 2000, as evidenced by the returned receipt postcard bearing the stamp of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, a copy of which is attached hereto. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to return an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form, indicating that the reference listed thereon has been considered and made of record in the present application. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of the IDS and a copy of the PTO-1449 form also are attached.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-3, 4, 7, 8, 12-15, 17, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,157,650 (Okuyama et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,403 (DeRodeff et al.); that Claims 2, 10, 11, and 16 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al. in view of DeRodeff et al., and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 11-187453 (Masakazu et al.); and that Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al. in view of DeRodeff et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,116 (Matsuda et al.). Cancellation of Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-17, and 19-21 renders their rejections moot. Applicants

submit that new independent Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37, together with the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 22 is directed to a communication system that includes a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is communicable to the first apparatus and the second apparatus.

The communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a conversion unit, and a second communication unit. The first communication unit is adapted to receive a first video data encoded by a first encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus. The conversion unit is adapted to convert the first video data into a second video data encoded by a second encoding system. The second communication unit is adapted to transmit the second video data to the second apparatus.

Okuyama et al. relates to a system for connecting to a network, and discloses a node c, which mutually connects a wireless network and a wired network. DeRodeff et al. relates to a system for broadcasting digital signals, and discloses a set-top box 14, which performs the function of converting a digital video signal into an analog video signal and also performs the reverse function of converting an analog video signal into a digital video signal.

Applicants submit that a combination of Okuyama et al. and DeRodeff et al., assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a communication system that includes a communication apparatus that is communicable to a first

apparatus in a wireless network, and also is communicable to a second apparatus in a wired network, wherein "the communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a conversion unit, and a second communication unit," and "the first communication unit is adapted to receive a first video data encoded by a first encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus," and "the conversion unit is adapted to convert the first video data into a second video data encoded by a second encoding system," and "the second communication unit is adapted to transmit the second video data to the second apparatus," as recited in Claim 22.

The node c disclosed in Okuyama et al. is not understood to function to convert a first video data encoded by a first encoding system into a second video data encoded by a second encoding system, as well as to convert the second video data into the first video data. Similarly, the set-top box 14 disclosed in DeRodeff et al. is not understood to function to convert a first video data encoded by a first encoding system into a second video data encoded by a second encoding system, as well as to convert the second video data into the first video data.

More specifically, neither Okuyama et al. nor DeRodeff et al., considered separately or in combination, is seen to disclose or suggest the features of receiving a first video data encoded by a first encoding system and transmitted from a first apparatus in a wireless network; and converting the first video data into a second video data encoded by a second encoding system; and transmitting the second video data to a second apparatus in a wired network.

Further, nothing has been found in Masakazu et al. or Matsuda et al. that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of Okuyama et al. and DeRodeff et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 22 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claims 25 and 28 include similar reception, conversion, and transmission features as those of Claim 22 and, therefore, also are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 31 is directed to a communication system that includes a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is communicable to the first apparatus and the second apparatus.

The communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a conversion unit, and a second communication unit. The second communication unit is adapted to receive a second video data encoded by a second encoding system and transmitted from the second apparatus. The conversion unit is adapted to convert the second video data into a first video data encoded by a first encoding system. The first communication unit is adapted to transmit the first video data to the first apparatus.

Applicants submit that a combination of Okuyama et al. and DeRodeff et al., assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a communication system that includes a communication apparatus that is communicable to a first apparatus in a wireless network, and also is communicable to a second apparatus in a wired network, wherein "the communication apparatus includes a first communication unit, a conversion unit, and a second communication unit," and "the second communication unit is

adapted to receive a second video data encoded by a second encoding system and transmitted from the second apparatus," and "the conversion unit is adapted to convert the second video data into a first video data encoded by a first encoding system," and "the first communication unit is adapted to transmit the first video data to the first apparatus," as recited in Claim 31.

Similar to the discussion above in connection with Claim 22, neither Okuyama et al. nor DeRodeff et al., considered individually or in combination, is seen to disclose or suggest the features of receiving a second video data encoded by a second encoding system and transmitted from a second apparatus in a wired network; and converting the second video data into a first video data encoded by a first encoding system; and transmitting the first video data to a first apparatus in a wireless network.

Further, nothing has been found in Masakazu et al. or Matsuda et al. that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of Okuyama et al. and DeRodeff et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 31 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claims 34 and 37 include similar reception, conversion, and transmission features as those of Claim 31 and, therefore, also are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as for Claim 31.


The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is

respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Lock SEE Yu-JAHVES
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 330327v1